

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 13-16 are all the claims pending in the application, where claims 9 and 12 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 15 and 16 are added.

**I. Objections to the Specification**

The specification is objected to as failing to provide support for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner refers to 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP 608.01(o), asserting that correction is required with regard to the phrase “slot-in portion is smaller than a cross-section of the cross-over portion,” as recited in claim 9, and the phrase “a gap between the insulation coating of each adjacent element of the conductor” as recited in claim 12.

As noted above, claims 9 and 12 are canceled.

The Examiner further asserts that correction is required with regard to the phrase “the ends of the at least one coil element connect the coil element of the slot-in portion in the plurality of slots, [and] distances between adjacent, parallel ends of the at least one coil element in the cross-over portion are different” as recited in claim 11.

Applicant notes that at least paragraph 22 provides sufficient antecedent basis for the claimed “ends of coil elements” recited in claim 11. For example, paragraph 22 discloses, “the cross-over portion (coil end portion) 44b...”. Furthermore, FIG. 4 shows a plurality of cross-over portions (coil end portions) 44b. FIG. 4 shows that at least some of the coil end portions are parallel. Additionally, FIG. 4 shows that distances between the parallel coil end portions, which correspond to adjacent coil elements, are different. Clearly, at least paragraph 22 and FIG. 4 of the specification and drawings, respectively, provide support for the claimed subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these objections.

II. Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claimed features of the “slot-in portion is smaller than a cross-section of the cross-over portion,” as recited in claim 9, and “a gap between the insulation coating of each adjacent element of the conductor” as recited in claim 12, are not shown in the drawings.

As noted above, claims 9 and 12 are canceled.

The Examiner further asserts that the claimed feature of “the ends of the at least one coil element connect the coil element of the slot-in portion in the plurality of slots, [and] distances between adjacent, parallel ends of the at least one coil element in the cross-over portion are different” as recited in claim 11 is not shown in the drawings. As noted above, with respect to the Examiner’s objection to the specification, at least FIG. 4 of the drawings provides support for the claimed subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these objections.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

As noted above, claims 9 and 12 are canceled.

With respect to claim 11, the Examiner asserts that there is insufficient written support for the feature of “the ends of the at least one coil element connect the coil element of the slot-in

portion in the plurality of slots, [and] distances between adjacent, parallel ends of the at least one coil element in the cross-over portion are different” as recited in the claim. As noted above, with respect to the Examiner’s objection to the specification, at least paragraph 22 and FIG. 4 of the specification and drawings, respectively, provide support for the claimed subject matter.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)<sup>1</sup> as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0043886; hereinafter “Fujita”) and Oohashi et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0015932; hereinafter “Oohashi ‘932”). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita and Oohashi ‘932 in further view of Umeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,326; hereinafter “Umeda”). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita and Oohashi ‘932 in further view of Asao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,281,612; hereinafter “Asao”). Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita and Oohashi ‘932 in further view of Oohashi et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0096958; hereinafter “Oohashi ‘958”). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita and Oohashi ‘932 in further view of Ohashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,205; hereinafter “Ohashi ‘205”). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita and Oohashi ‘932 in further view of Oohashi et al. (EP 1294076; hereinafter “Oohashi ‘076”). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita and Oohashi ‘932 in further view of Kusase et al. (U.S. Patent

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant notes that the Examiner incorrectly indicates this as a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Since the Examiner acknowledges that Fujita fails to teach or suggest all the claimed features recited in independent claim 1 (Office Action, page 5), and instead relies on Oohashi ‘932 to address the deficiencies of Fujita, the proper statute for the rejection is 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant will treat the rejection as such.

No. 6,147,432; hereinafter “Kusase”). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita and Oohashi ‘932 in further view Yumiyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,587,619; hereinafter “Yumiyama”). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 is amended and recites an ac generator for a vehicle comprising, *inter alia*, “a rotor having field windings and a plurality of fan blades which bend incoming air at a right angle”.

Fujita discloses that “cooling air flows into the case 3 from openings A of the case 3 in accordance with rotation of the fan 7b which rotates together with rotation of the rotor 6” (paragraph 107). Specifically, Fujita discloses that “the cooling air is flowed in an outside **radial direction** by the fan 7b and is discharged to the outside from an opening B” and that “this cooling air is flowed in an outside **radial direction** by the fan 7b and is discharged to the outside from an opening D”. Fujita does not teach or suggest a rotor comprising “a plurality of fan blades which bend incoming air at a right angle” as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 also recites an ac generator for a vehicle comprising, *inter alia*, “at least longer side portion of the conductor of the slot-in portion located in the slots has an insulation coating of which thickness is smaller than that of insulation coating in the cross-over portion”.

The Examiner relies on Fig. 12 of Fujita as allegedly disclosing this claimed feature. However, Fig. 12 is merely a perspective view showing a stator for an alternator (paragraph 142). Fig. 12 in no way teaches or suggests insulation coating of a slot-in portion being smaller in thickness than that of insulation of a cross-over portion.

Oohashi ‘932 fails to address the above-identified deficiencies of Fujita.

Furthermore, neither Umeda, Oohashi '958, Ohashi '205, Oohashi '076, Kusase nor Yumiyama, independently or in combination, address the above-identified deficiencies of Fujita and Oohashi '932.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Applicant further submits that claims 2-8, 10, 13 and 14 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 11 is amended and recite one or more features analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is patentable at least for reasons analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1.

V. New Claims

Applicant adds new claims 15 and 16, support for which may be found at least in paragraphs 34 to 37 of the published application. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1 and at least by virtue of the subject matter recited therein.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Rohit K. Krishna /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Rohit K. Krishna  
Registration No. 62,474

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 8, 2009